

Application No. 10/520,452  
December 29, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action dated August 26, 2008  
Page 6 of 11

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet of Drawings includes a new Figure.

Attachment: New Sheet.

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 34-36 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant AMENDS the specification; CANCELS claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-26, and 29-33; and ADDS claims 34-36 and the drawing.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claim 15 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner alleged that the subject matter of the present application admits of an illustration by a drawing to facilitate understanding of the invention. Applicant has submitted a drawing and amended the specification to refer to the drawing. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, on page 10, line 19 to page 11, line 24 and page 11, line 33 to page 12, line 8 of Applicant's originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been entered by this Amendment.

Claims 11 and 12 were objected to for allegedly containing minor informalities. Applicant has canceled claims 11 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claims 11 and 12 is moot.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 16 has been canceled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is moot.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 16-18, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Redding et al. (U.S. 2003/0128246). Claims 3, 6, 23, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redding et al. in view of Dewitte et al. (U.S. 2002/0008880). Claims 8-14, 19, 20, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redding et al. in view of Ben-Chorin et al. (U.S. 2002/0149546).

Applicant has canceled claims 1-3, 5-21, 23-26, and 29-33 and added new claims 34-36.

New claim 34 recites:

A method for reproducing an image including process colors in a first

colorant space and a non-process color on a first printer having a first printer model, the first printer model being arranged to transform the first colorant space into a device independent color space, and the first printer model having an inverse first printer model arranged to transform the device independent color space into the first colorant space, the method comprising the steps of:

**analyzing the image to detect first portions in the image having only process colors and second portions having non-process colors;**

reproducing the first portions of the image in the first colorant space on the first printer;

**reproducing the second portions of the image on the first printer by:**

creating a dedicated printer model that encompasses the non-process color and that has a one-to-one relation to the device independent color space;

**using the dedicated printer model to transform the second portions into the device independent color space;**

**using the inverse first printer model to transform the second portions from the device independent color space to the first colorant space;** and

reproducing the second portions in the first colorant space on the first printer. (emphasis added)

With the unique combination of features and method steps recited in Applicant's claim 34, including the features and method steps of "analyzing the image to detect first portions in the image having only process colors and second portions having non-process colors," "reproducing the second portions of the image on the first printer by," "using the dedicated printer model to transform the second portions into the device independent color space," and "using the inverse first printer model to transform the second portions from the device independent color space to the first colorant space," Applicant has been able to obtain higher color quality and reduce the overall image processing by separating the processing of the portions of an image having only process colors and the portions of an image having both process and non-process colors (see, for example, page 7, lines 25-33 and page 8, lines 16-21 of Applicant's specification).

The Examiner alleged that Redding et al. teaches all of the features and method steps recited in Applicant's claim 1, including analyzing an image for an overlap of a specific color with another color and creating a model for the output device based on the analysis, wherein the model encompasses the specific color.

Applicant's new claim 34 recites the features and method steps of "analyzing the image to detect first portions in the image having only process colors and second portions having non-process colors," "reproducing the second portions of the image on the first printer by," "using the dedicated printer model to transform the second portions into the device independent color space," and "using the inverse first printer model to transform the second portions from the device independent color space to the first colorant space." Support for new claim 34 can be found, for example, page 7, line 16 to page 8, line 14; page 10, lines 20-25; page 11, lines 33-35; page 13, line 30 to page 14, line 17; and page 15, lines 27-32 of Applicant's originally filed specification. Support for new claims 35 and 36 can be found in, for example, original claims 13-15.

In contrast, Redding et al. teaches simultaneously converting ALL of the image data of the specific color and the another color into a driver format (e.g., an inverse printer model) which can drive the ink jet printer (see, for example, paragraph [0015] of Redding et al.). Redding et al. does not remotely teach or suggest using a first printer model having an inverse printer model for the process colors and a separate, dedicated printer model for the non-process colors.

Thus, Redding et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features and method steps of "analyzing the image to detect first portions in the image having only process colors and second portions having non-process colors," "reproducing the second portions of the image on the first printer by," "using the dedicated printer model to transform the second portions into the device independent color space," and "using the inverse first printer model to transform the second portions from the device independent color space to the first colorant space," as recited in Applicant's claim 34.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that a rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Redding et al. would be improper.

The Examiner relied upon Dewitte et al. and Ben-Chorin et al. to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Redding et al. However, Dewitte et al. and Ben-Chorin et al. clearly fail to teach or suggest the features and method steps of "analyzing the image to detect first portions in the image having only process colors and second portions having non-process colors," "reproducing the second portions of the image on the first printer by,"

“using the dedicated printer model to transform the second portions into the device independent color space,” and “using the inverse first printer model to transform the second portions from the device independent color space to the first colorant space,” as recited in Applicant’s claim 34. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Dewitte et al. and Ben-Chorin et al. fail to cure the deficiencies of Redding et al. described above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Redding et al., Dewitte et al., and Ben-Chorin et al., applied alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the unique features and method steps recited in Applicant’s claim 34.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 is allowable. Claims 35 and 36 depend upon claim 34, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 34 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to December 29, 2008(December 26, 2008 falls on a Federal Holiday and December 27, 2008 and December 28, 2008 fall on a Saturday and Sunday, respectively), the period for response to the Office Action dated August 26, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 29, 2008

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Stephen R. Funk  
Registration No. 57,751